



AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the six replacement sheets of drawings, including figures 1-7, for the six sheets of drawings, including figures 1-7, of the originally filed application. Figures 1-7 have been amended to delete stray markings, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided and for the acknowledgment of Applicants' Information Disclosure Statements by return of the Forms PTO-1449.

Upon entry of the above amendment, the abstract will have been amended, claims 2 and 4 will have been canceled, and claims 1, 3, and 5-14 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, and 5-14 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3, and 5-14 in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract as being too long. In response thereto, Applicants are submitting herewith an amended abstract, including the required corrections. Accordingly, in view of the above noted amendments and remarks, it is believed that the objection to the specification has been overcome, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as being messy and including stray markings. In response thereto, Applicants are submitting herewith six replacement sheets of formal drawings including the required corrections. Accordingly, in view of the above noted amendments and remarks, it is believed that the objection to the drawings has been overcome, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-3 as containing grammatical errors. In response thereto, claims 1 and 3 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Claim 2 has been canceled. Accordingly, in view of the above noted amendments and remarks, it is believed that the objection to the claims has been overcome, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 as being replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors, as lacking antecedent for various terms, and as being unclear and/or incomplete. In response thereto, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, and 5-14 to place the claims in better form, including the required corrections as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, in view of the above noted amendments and remarks, claims 1, 3, and 5-14 are believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

This amendment is fully supported by the specification, including the claims and drawings, and no prohibited new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by VAN DER BORST et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,535).

Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2 and 4 is now moot.

Further, although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection of the claims on this ground, nevertheless, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clearly obviate the above noted ground of rejection in order to expedite prosecution of the present application. In this regard, Applicants note that VAN DER BORST et al. fails to show each and every element recited in the amended claim. In particular, claim 1, as amended, sets forth an electric razor including, inter alia, "a driving portion that drives either or both the inner blade and the outer blade; and a controller that operatively changes the driving portion between a normal drive mode allowing the user to shave the hair, and a cleaning drive mode allowing the user to clean the blades, wherein in the cleaning drive mode, the controller controls at least one of a driving frequency defined by the number of reciprocations of the inner blade per unit time, the number of revolutions per unit time defined by the number of rotations of the inner blade per unit time, and a driving amplitude defined by a distance moved by the inner blade in one reciprocation so that a moving speed is set to be suitable for cleaning the blades".

The VAN DER BORST et al. patent discloses a shaver including an apparatus that controls the motor speed. The VAN DER BORST et al. patent discloses that the shaver may operate with different motor speeds for the user's desired combination of shaving performance, shaving comfort, and power consumption (*i.e.*, the P, M, and C settings). See, for example, the abstract. The VAN DER BORST et al. patent does not disclose controlling the motor to change between driving in a normal drive mode and a cleaning drive mode. In

fact, VAN DER BORST et al. does not disclose that the shaver includes a cleaning drive mode. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, none of the P, M, or C settings comprise a cleaning mode. All of the P, M, and, C settings are specifically disclosed by VAN DER BORST et al. as shaving settings. Additionally, VAN DER BORST et al. does not disclose any particular driving frequency, number of revolutions per unit time, or blade amplitude. Moreover, the VAN DER BORST et al. patent fails to disclose a controller that controls one of the driving frequency, number of revolutions per unit time, or blade amplitude, so that the blades are driven at a cleaning mode speed. Thus, the VAN DER BORST et al. patent does not show a shaver including, inter alia, "a driving portion that drives either or both the inner blade and the outer blade; and a controller that operatively changes the driving portion between a normal drive mode allowing the user to shave the hair, and a cleaning drive mode allowing the user to clean the blades, wherein in the cleaning drive mode, the controller controls at least one of a driving frequency defined by the number of reciprocations of the inner blade per unit time, the number of revolutions per unit time defined by the number of rotations of the inner blade per unit time, and a driving amplitude defined by a distance moved by the inner blade in one reciprocation so that a moving speed is set to be suitable for cleaning the blades", as set forth in amended claim 1. Since the reference fails to show each and every element of the claimed device, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over VAN DER BORST et al. is improper and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 6-11 and 13, which are at least patentable due to their dependency from claim 1 for the reasons noted above, recite additional features of the invention and are also separately patentable over the prior art of record based on the additionally recited features.

Claims 3, 5, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over VAN DER BORST et al.

Applicants note that VAN DER BORST et al. fails to teach or suggest the subject matter claimed, including, inter alia, "a driving portion that drives either or both the inner blade and the outer blade; and a controller that operatively changes the driving portion between a normal drive mode allowing the user to shave the hair, and a cleaning drive mode allowing the user to clean the blades, wherein in the cleaning drive mode, the controller controls at least one of a driving frequency defined by the number of reciprocations of the inner blade per unit time, the number of revolutions per unit time defined by the number of rotations of the inner blade per unit time, and a driving amplitude defined by a distance moved by the inner blade in one reciprocation so that a moving speed is set to be suitable for cleaning the blades", as set forth in amended independent claim 1, as described above. The Examiner has concluded that modifying the VAN DER BORST et al. device to include the claimed blade speed, multiple drive modes, and indicator would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. However, Applicants submit that nothing in the applied prior art teaches or suggests the claimed combination including the claimed blade speed, multiple drive modes, and indicator. Further, none of the prior art teaches or suggests a

controller that changes between a normal drive mode and a cleaning drive mode, and that controls one of a driving frequency, a number of revolutions, and a driving amplitude to set a moving speed for cleaning the blades. Therefore, even if one were led to make the modification asserted by the Examiner, the claimed combination would not result. Accordingly, Applicants submit that a factual basis for the rejection has not been established and thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and that rejection of claims 3, 5, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can only result from a review of Applicant's disclosure and the application of impermissible hindsight. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over VAN DER BORST et al. is improper for all the above reasons and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over VAN DER BORST et al. in view of DEKKER (EP 652 087).

Applicants note that VAN DER BORST et al. fails to teach or suggest the subject matter claimed, including, *inter alia*, "a driving portion that drives either or both the inner blade and the outer blade; and a controller that operatively changes the driving portion between a normal drive mode allowing the user to shave the hair, and a cleaning drive mode allowing the user to clean the blades, wherein in the cleaning drive mode, the controller controls at least one of a driving frequency defined by the number of reciprocations of the inner blade per unit time, the number of revolutions per unit time defined by the number of rotations of the inner blade per unit time, and a driving amplitude defined by a

distance moved by the inner blade in one reciprocation so that a moving speed is set to be suitable for cleaning the blades", as set forth in amended independent claim 1, as described above. Further, DEKKER fails to cure these deficiencies. Moreover, there is nothing in the cited prior art that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to make the modification suggested by the Examiner in the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over VAN DER BORST et al. in view of DEKKER. Thus, the only reason to combine the teachings of VAN DER BORST et al. and DEKKER results from a review of Applicants' disclosure and the application of impermissible hindsight. Even if the teachings of VAN DER BORST et al. and DEKKER were combined, as suggested by the Examiner, the claimed combination would not result. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over VAN DER BORST et al. in view of DEKKER is improper for all the above reasons and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of objections and rejections, and an early indication of the allowance of claims 1, 3, and 5-14.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present amendment is proper and that none of the references of record, considered alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious Applicants' invention as recited in claims 1, 3, and 5-14. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Accordingly, consideration of the present amendment, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action, and allowance of the present amendment and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, which do not narrow the scope of the claims, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered cosmetic in nature, and to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Yasuo IBUKI et al.

Linda J. Hodge
Reg. #47,348

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

November 27, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Attachment: Six Replacement Sheets of Drawings